

### Remarks

The Applicant has included an inventorship amendment with this response. A new declaration and power of attorney is included with this amendment.

Claim 21 has been canceled subject to Applicant's right to file a divisional application for the subject matter recited in claim 21. The rejection of claim 21 is thus obviated.

The Examiner rejected claims 17-20, 23-26, and 28-30 as being anticipated under 35 USC § 102(b) by Ripich 5,916,228. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Ripich '228 does not disclose or suggest the debris retention recess or a working edge that is disposed concave with respect to the tongue. The Examiner cited a gap disposed between a pair of working edges in the Ripich reference. This gap does not function as a debris retention recess. The cited gap is simply a through-opening disposed between two working edges in the double-working edge embodiment. Nothing in Ripich describes this gap. The Applicant submits debris piles against the flat working edges in the Ripich '228 device in a manner similar to numerous prior art devices. There is no retention recess in the '228 Ripich reference. Ripich thus does not anticipate the claims.


In order to clarify the location of the claimed debris retention recess, the Applicant has amended each of the independent claims to specify the location and structure of the recess. Claim 17 has been amended to recite that the recess is defined in the front surface of the scraping wall. Ripich does not have any recesses defined by its front surface of its scraping wall. Claim 23 has been amended to recite that the recess is disposed in the scraping wall between the upper and lower edges of the scraping wall. Ripich does not disclose any recesses in its scraping wall. Claim 28 recites that the recess is entirely defined by the scraping wall. The gap cited by the Examiner is disposed between a pair of walls and is thus not entirely defined by a single scraping wall as recited in claim 28.

In addition to the amendments to the independent claims, the Applicant has amended dependent claims 20, 26, and 30 to clarify the type of concave working edge being claimed. None of the working edges of Ripich as concave with respect to the tongue in the manner recited in these claims.

The remaining rejections are obviated by the patentability of the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the claims and most earnestly solicits the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance for the claims.

Please call the undersigned attorney if any issues remain after this amendment.



Fred H. Zollinger III

Registration No. 39,438

Zollinger & Burleson Ltd.

P.O. Box 2368


North Canton, OH 44720

Phone: 330-526-0104

Fax: 1-866-311-9964

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence (Amendment B in application serial no. 10/371,585 filed 02-21-2003) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or is being transmitted by facsimile to 703-872-9306 on February 22, 2005.



Fred H. Zollinger III, Registration no. 39,438